

**Testimony  
Ralph Eno  
1<sup>st</sup> Selectman Town of Lyme  
Before the  
Environment Committee  
March 11, 2015**

- **SB- 366 AN ACT EXTENDING THE BAN ON THE USE OF LAWN CARE PESTICIDES TO SCHOOLS THAT HOUSE GRADES NINE TO TWELVE, INCLUSIVE, AND TO STATE FACILITIES**
- **SB- 1063 AN ACT CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF PESTICIDES ON SCHOOL GROUNDS AND CERTAIN PUBLIC SPACES, AUTHORIZING THE USE OF CERTAIN MICROBIALS AND REESTABLISHING THE PESTICIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL**

The Town of Lyme Board of Selectmen opposes **SB-366** and **SB-1063**, which extend the ban on the use of Integrated Pest Management Plans to high schools and other public grounds.

Since the ban on the use of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Plans on K-8 school grounds became effective on July 1, 2010, our Lyme/Old Lyme Regional School District has experienced significant difficulties maintaining athletic fields and school grounds in addition to our shared Park and Recreation facility on Town Woods Road in Old Lyme.

This situation is not unique to Lyme and Old Lyme. Numerous towns throughout Connecticut have athletic fields, fence lines and school grounds which simply cannot be maintained adequately and safely due to the restrictions on the use of Integrated Pest Management Plans. It is just a matter of time before our school and recreational athletic field infrastructure is rendered unusable due to infestations or invasive species.

SB-366 and SB-1053, by extending the ban to include high school fields, parks, playgrounds, and municipal greens, will result in more fields and grounds falling into disrepair, creating potentially hazardous situations for residents and visitors.

Moreover, the ban on Integrated Pest Management is simply not justified. Integrated Pest Management only authorizes the *judicious application of pesticides under very limited circumstances* to help ensure that towns can properly manage athletic fields to protect the safety of student athletes. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's recent update on Integrated Pest Management, IPM is a cost-effective way of reducing exposure to pests and pesticides while *reducing* overall pesticide use. Given these findings, it is surprising that Connecticut does not consider repealing the ban on IPM.

Understandably, communities want to continue to do their part to ensure that state laws and policies involving the use of pesticides are successful in protecting the health and safety of our children. Towns have been actively searching for ways in which to proceed, but continue to be faced with differing viewpoints and somewhat conflicting studies relative to pesticides

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Respectfully,

Ralph Eno

1<sup>st</sup> Selectman

Town of Lyme